DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 681 UD 021 554

AUTHOR Anton, Kristin P.
TITLE Socioeconomic Factors in Preparation for Higher Education Among Whites, Blacks, Hispanics and Asians.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April, 1981). Some tables may be marginally legible due to small type size.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Education; Asian Americans; Black Students; College Admission; *College Bound Students; *College Preparation; Educational Background; Educational Counseling; *Educational Opportunities; *Educational Status Comparison; Higher Education; Hispanic Americans; *Minority Groups; *Parent Background; Parent Role; Secondary Education; Socioeconomic Status; Teacher Role; White Students
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

This analysis of the high school preparation patterns of the California public high school class of 1975 drew upon sociological literature on status attainment in an attempt to identify specific intervention points at which to enlist minority parents' support for college preparation. Sources of data were: (1) a sample of 1975 public high school transcripts; (2) completed follow-up questionnaires from a student subsample of the transcripts; and (3) test scores from students who took the SAT or ACT. Since University of California admission is based primarily on a sequence of college preparatory courses, while California State Universities and Colleges admission depends mainly on overall grade point average (GPA), courses and GPA were the dependent variables selected for the study. Independent variables included: (1) parents' education; (2) family income; (3) number of parents; and (4) number of siblings. A multiple regression formula was used for partitioning ethnic group mean differences in high school grades and courses between whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Asians. Results of the study indicated the need for outreach programs (1) to work with high school teachers and parents to raise achievement standards of black and Hispanic students, and (2) to reach parents and students with information about courses required for college admission. (Author/APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED205641

SOCIOECONOMIC FACTORS IN PREPARATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION AMONG WHITES, BLACKS, HISPANICS AND ASIANS

Kristin P. Anton
University of California,
Berkeley

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 1981

CG021554

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kristin P. Anton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SOCIOECONOMIC FACTORS IN PREPARATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
AMONG WHITES, BLACKS, HISPANICS, AND ASIANS

Increasing the numbers of black and Hispanic high school graduates enrolling in and completing baccalaureate degree programs is a major concern of higher education policy makers in the 1980s. Not only do many Americans maintain the commitment to equal opportunity generated by the 1960s civil rights movement, but also, particularly in an ethnically diverse state such as California, there is an urgent need to recruit minority students to fill places in universities and colleges threatened by declining enrollment.

California, like many states, has a three-tiered system of public higher education. The eight-campus University of California (UC) admits high school graduates who rank in the top one-eighth of the high school class, defined as the completion of a sequence of at least 11 college preparatory courses with a B+ average*. The California State Universities and Colleges (CSUC) admit students from the top one-third of the high school class, defined as a minimum B+ overall grade point average (GPA) in nearly all high school courses or, for students with lower grades, on a sliding scale with higher Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores.** California's 100 community colleges admit all high school graduates.

Although UC- and CSUC-eligible black students attend the institutions for which they qualify at higher rates than qualified whites, and Hispanic students at approximately equal rates, compared to whites (see Table 1), far fewer qualify for admission to these California, public four-year institutions.

*In 1979 (in addition to course requirements) the University of California extended a minimal GPA/test score sliding scale to a wider range (from 3.0-3.1 to 2.7-3.3).

**The sliding scale covers the GPA range, 2.0-3.2.

In 1975 only 7% of black and 5% of Hispanic high school graduates qualified for admission to UC, compared to 16% of white and 39% of Asian graduates. Just 16% of black and 19% of Hispanic graduates were eligible for admission to CSUC, compared to 38% of white and 60% of Asian graduates (UCSA, 1978).

The college enrollment rates of black and Hispanic students, given a level of high school preparation (UC eligible, CSUC eligible, or ineligible--see Table 1), testify to the effectiveness of higher education-sponsored informational, motivational, and financial aid programs designed to assist minority and disadvantaged students in their quest for the baccalaureate degree. On the other hand, the low rates of UC and CSUC eligibility for black and Hispanic Students, compared to whites and Asians, suggest that, in the 1980s, educators must consider the possible role of higher education institutions in assisting secondary schools to improve the quality of minority students' high school preparation, both in terms of taking college preparatory courses and achieving high grades in these courses. Not only would more rigorous high school preparation of minority students produce larger pools of students qualified for admission to selective, postsecondary institutions, but it would also decrease attrition of minority students during the baccalaureate degree program.

Intervention Point: Parents' Influence on Students' Educational Attainment

The propensity to prepare for and utilize the higher education system depends considerably upon the education, occupation, and income of the student's parents, as well as the experience of the student's ethnic group in American society. In particular, parents' educational level consistently has been shown to relate to children's educational attainments, among the white populations

generally studied (Sewell & Hauser, 1975: Blau & Duncan, 1967) Sociologists infer from this relationship that parents who have more years of education attempt to motivate their children to utilize the resources of the school to a greater extent than parents who have less education (Sewell & Hauser, 1975). Parents with baccalaureate and graduate degrees are especially concerned that their children maintain family status by earning college degrees (Jencks & Riesman, 1968).

Both parents' socioeconomic status and attitudes toward the importance of schooling have been found to affect placement in the college preparatory track (Alexander et al., 1978). Compared to track placement, parents' socio-economic status is less associated with children's grades in school (Hauser et al., 1976). Although parents have a greater influence on the courses their children take than on the grades they receive in those courses, the payoff to college preparatory courses is primarily at the point of enrollment in higher education. Recent studies of status attainment have found that the effects of high school grades on later performance persist throughout the college years, influencing retention and whether or not the student obtains the baccalaureate degree. The effects of placement in the college preparatory track, on the other hand, end with effects on entrance into college (Jencks et al., 1979; Hauser et al., 1976).

Since parents have the capacity to influence students' educational attainments, working with parents is a critical intervention point for educational policy. This analysis of the high school preparation patterns of the California public high school class of 1975 draws upon sociology's status attainment literature in an attempt to identify specific intervention points at which to enlist minority parents' support for college preparation.

Data Sources

Sources of data were a sample of 10,000 1975 public high school transcripts collected by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) for its 1976 UC and CSUC eligibility study, and 4131 completed follow-up questionnaires from a 6115-student subsample of the transcripts, collected by UC Systemwide Administration in 1976-77. High school transcript data included grades and information on academic courses necessary for CPEC's computation of UC and CSUC eligibility rates. Test scores were available only for the students who took the SAT or ACT. Questionnaire data included information on demographic background and colleges attended. The follow-up sample with complete information for the regression analyses included 2703 whites, 163 blacks, 362 Hispanics, and 236 Asians.

Variables selected for analysis

Since UC admission is based primarily on a sequence of college preparatory courses, while CSUC admission depends mainly on overall grade point average (GPA), courses and GPA were the dependent variables selected for the study. It is assumed that the quality of the GPA and the number of college preparatory courses taken reflect, at least in part, the extent to which students put time and effort into academic pursuits and are knowledgeable about higher education admission requirements. The independent variables were selected from the status attainment literature: parents' education, family income, number of siblings, and the number of parents are assumed to be proxies for the motivational and financial resources that a family provides its children to prepare for, then attend, college or university. The literature on ethnicity suggests, however,

that status attainment processes vary among the ethnic minorities, compared to whites. Additional factors--sex, region of the state, whether or not a foreign language is spoken in the home, and ethnic composition of the high school--are controlled in the analysis.

Methods

The statistical method used in the study is multiple regression analysis. Equations were estimated for each of the ethnic groups (Tables A2, A3, A4, & A5). The hypothesis was tested that patterns of the relationships between background characteristics and preparation for college (slopes), as well as additive effects (intercepts), differ among the ethnic minorities, compared to whites. The Chow F-test was used to test the contrast of whites with each of the three ethnic minorities. All of the contrasts were significant at the .01 level.

In this paper, the pairwise comparison of each ethnic minority with the white majority is disaggregated. The group mean differences in high school GPA and college preparatory courses are partitioned into effects of differences in the coefficients on the background variables and effects of differences in the means of these variables. These comparisons locate differential family background assets for educational achievement and how they operate.

The multiple regression formula used for the partitioning of the group mean differences in high school grades and courses is of the following form:

Mean outcome* for the white sample:

$$\bar{Y}_1 = a_o + a_1\bar{X}_{11} + \ldots + a_9\bar{X}_{91}$$

Mean outcome* for the minority sample:

$$\bar{Y}_2 = b_o + b_1\bar{X}_{12} + \ldots + b_9\bar{X}_{92}$$

*The predicted mean equals the actual mean for each sample as a whole, since the average residual over all individuals in a regression equation is zero.

Equation for the difference in mean outcome between the two samples:

$$\bar{Y}_1 - \bar{Y}_2 = (a_o - b_o) + (a_1\bar{X}_{11} - b_1\bar{X}_{12}) + \ldots + (a_9\bar{X}_{91} - b_9\bar{X}_{92})$$

$$= (a_o - b_o) + \left(\frac{a_1 + b_1}{2}\right)(\bar{X}_{11} - \bar{X}_{12}) + (a_1 - b_1)\left(\frac{\bar{X}_{11} + \bar{X}_{12}}{2}\right) + \ldots$$

$$+ \left(\frac{a_9 + b_9}{2}\right)(\bar{X}_{91} - \bar{X}_{92}) + (a_9 - b_9)\left(\frac{\bar{X}_{91} + \bar{X}_{92}}{2}\right)$$

Using this equation, we may first compare the portion of the differential explained by the regression and the portion due to differences in constants. The latter represents the part of the group mean difference unexplained by the variables in the equation. Unexplained ethnic group differences typically are attributed to discrimination, or to something unique to that ethnic group's experience. Next we may break down the portion of the differential explained by the regression into two components: differences in coefficient effects and differences in average group characteristic effects. When computing the differences in coefficient effects, the average of the means of the two groups is used. Similarly, the average of the coefficients of the two groups used when computing the differences in mean effects.

The net positive effects of differences in means indicate the advantages in endowments usually possessed by the majority group. The net effects of the differences in coefficients indicate the difference between the value of these endowments for the white majority compared to their value for the minority group. In other words, the latter measure reflects the extent to which the identical set of characteristics does or does not produce the same college preparation outcomes for high school graduates of various ethnic backgrounds. Thus, the coefficient portion of the differential, as well as the difference in constants, may be attributed to discrimination or to unique ethnic group experiences in American society.[3]

Results: Grade Point Average and College Preparatory Course Differentials

Using the equation explained above, this section breaks down the group differentials in grades and courses between white students and each of the three minority high school graduate populations into their component parts. The regression coefficients upon which the tables are based are provided in an appendix (Tables A2-A5).

Comparison of white with black high school graduates

Table 1 decomposes the overall .39 GPA advantage of whites over blacks into its component parts: differences in constants, differences in means of the variables in the equation, and differences in coefficients on these variables. Apart from considerations of family and regional background characteristics, blacks have higher grades than whites, on the average (-.28). However, the regression accounts for a .67 GPA differential in favor of whites. The net effects of differences in means--family and regional endowments--have little to do with producing the black/white GPA differential (.0570). The differential is due primarily to the net differences in coefficient effects (.6114), particularly the difference in the coefficients on parents' years of schooling (1.05). The advantage of white over black students in translating their parents' years of education into higher grades (1.05) outweighs the advantage of black over white students in translating parents' income into higher grades (-.2680).

On the average, white students in this sample took 1.3 more college preparatory courses than blacks (Table 1). Apart from the regression, whites took more of these courses (.5380). In addition, the regression itself accounted for a .85 advantage of whites over blacks. Unlike the GPA differential, however, net effects on number of college preparatory courses of differences in means (.6340) were much greater than net effects of differences in coefficients

(.2151). White students' possession of greater quantities of the characteristics that contribute to the taking of college preparatory courses (parents' education --particularly at the level of the BA or above-- family income, and smaller families) increase the white/black differential substantially. Nevertheless, the difference in the coefficients on parents' years of schooling again favors whites (3.409).

Comparison of white with Hispanic high school graduates

The GPA differential between whites and Hispanics is nearly as great as that between whites and blacks (.32 versus .39). Table 3 displays the decomposition of the overall advantage of whites over Hispanics into its component parts. Similar to the black/white comparison, Hispanics have slightly higher grades than whites apart from the regression (-.1890). The regression itself, however, accounts for a .53 difference in favor of whites. Unlike the case for blacks, the net effects of whites' advantages over Hispanics in family background characteristics are nearly as great as differences in the net effects of these endowments on grades (.2131 versus .3151). The greater number of years of schooling of white, compared to Hispanic, parents contributes most to the white/Hispanic GPA differential (.1190). However, similar to the case for blacks, Hispanic high school graduates have been less likely than whites to translate the advantages of more highly educated parents into higher grades (.5890).

White high school graduates in this sample took 1.6 more college preparatory courses, on the average, than Hispanic graduates. Apart from the family and regional background characteristics included in the regression, Hispanic students appear to have a sizable advantage over whites in the number of college preparatory courses taken during high school (- 3.8330). Advantages to white students

from the variables included in the regression more than outweight the Hispanic advantage in constants, however (5.3 versus -3.8). Greater endowments (parents' education, family income, and smaller families) partly account for the larger number of college preparatory courses taken by whites, compared to Hispanics (1.440). But the greater likelihood that white students translate family and regional endowments into additional college preparatory courses, compared to Hispanics, accounts for much more of the differential in courses taken (3.880). Similar to the white/black comparison, the difference in the coefficients on parents' years of education strongly favors whites (3.6130). Unlike the case for blacks, however, the effects of regional differences (living in metropolitan rather than rural counties) do not favor Hispanics over whites (.3465 and .5733 versus -.5998 and -.3523).

Comparison of white with Asian high school graduates

What is most striking about the white/Asian GPA and course differentials are the contributions of the differences in sample constants to these gaps. The Asian GPA constant is one-half of a grade point higher than the white GPA constant. Apart from the regression, Asian high school graduates have taken three more college preparatory courses than whites. Although most of the mean and coefficient differences in background variables work to the advantage of whites, they are not nearly enough to offset the basic Asian advantage in constants (see Table 4).

The greater endowments of whites, compared to Asians, in parents' years of schooling (.0700) and proportion of English-only-speaking families (.0405) are the most important differences in means narrowing the GPA differential. The effects of having fewer siblings contribute to narrowing the GPA differential between whites and Asians, since additional siblings appear to have less

adverse impact on the GPA of whites, compared to Asians (.0985). The differences in effects of parents' education and family income on GPA in the white and Asian samples slightly decrease the GPA differential, as well (.0510 and .0570).

Again, neither whites' advantages in parental endowments nor effects of these endowments on the number of college preparatory courses offsets the large Asian advantage in constant terms. Although white students are advantaged relative to Asians in the effects of both mean and coefficient differences of parents' education on courses taken, the effect of coefficient differences is not nearly so great as when whites are compared with blacks or Hispanics. In other words, although parents of Asian students have somewhat fewer years of schooling, on the average, than white parents, 1975 Asian high school graduates were nearly as likely as white graduates to translate their parents' additional years of schooling into additional college preparatory courses.

In summary, the effects of background variable mean and coefficient differences on GPA and courses are quite similar in the white and Asian groups. Consequently, the contributions of the coefficient and mean differences to the white/Asian GPA differential do not offset the basically higher GPA and number of college preparatory courses of the Asian group.

Discussion and Policy Implications

Historically, educational attainment has brought occupational and income rewards to the white majority.[1] Despite some evidence that this pattern may be changing, higher education degrees still improve the income potential of white Americans considerably (Freeman, 1976; Jencks et al., 1979). Education has provided a route to lucrative occupations for many immigrant groups. White ethnic minorities' striving for higher education has helped them surpass the Anglo-Saxon Protestant "majority" in occupational status and income

(Greeley, 1976; Blau & Duncan, 1967). Asian-Americans have utilized the educational system to prepare for technical occupations and professions where racial discrimination is minimal and job opportunities are expanding (Petersen, 1971).

Until recently, however, educational attainment has brought less certain rewards to blacks and Hispanics, due to pervasive discrimination in society and in the labor market. Social scientists infer that unequal group treatment at every step of the career ladder has produced the demonstrably lower degree of transmission of socioeconomic status from parents children observed for blacks, compared to whites (Duncan et al., 1972; Blau and Duncan, 1967). An anthropologist has described self-limiting effects on blacks' motivation as due to the historic "job ceiling" imposed on the aspirations of minority groups stigmatized by caste--in the United States, primarily blacks and Mexican-Americans (Ogbu, 1978).

Parents of the present generation of high school graduates generally achieved their own highest levels of education during the 1940s and 1950s, when the payoff to investment in education was problematic for blacks and Hispanics. Therefore, it is not surprising that the transmission of motivation for educational achievement from parents to children appears to be less for 1975 black and Hispanic high school graduates, compared to whites. Since the mid-1960s, however, political intervention to improve the educational and employment opportunities of blacks and Hispanics has resulted in sizable increases in minority enrollment in higher education, as well as the closing of the earnings gap between young college-educated whites and blacks (Ravitch, 1978; Freeman, 1977). Compensation for past generations of oppression and discrimination has been the rationale for current affirmative action efforts on behalf of these minority groups. One way for blacks and Hispanics to maintain group socioeconomic gains made since the 1960s is for successful parents to pass along some of their advantages to their children.

Perceiving the benefits to be gained today from a college education, minority parents often try to get their children into the college preparatory courses offered by the high school.[2] The more experience the parents have had with higher education, the more likely they are to succeed, particularly if the parents are college graduates.* Educational policy to inform parents and students of the courses needed for adequate college preparation strengthens this already existing parental influence.

Minority parents who themselves attained more schooling, compared to those with less education, undoubtedly want to influence their children's performance in school as well as the courses they take. Educational policy to help minority parents better implement the desire for their children to achieve would strengthen the relationship between parents' educational level and children's grades in school.

Grades are earned by students, yet awarded by teachers. Teachers' perceptions of students' school performance, as well as students' potential and actual achievement, influence the grades students receive. The lack of a relationship between minority parents' educational level and students' grades suggests the need for better home/school cooperation. It is possible that many teachers do not adequately identify talent associated with parental educational levels among minority youth, due to racial stereotyping. Unless teachers continually work at trying to understand their pupils as individuals, "with the passage of time teachers' perceptions become increasingly stereotyped (by ethnicity, sex, and class) and children become hardened caricatures of an initial discriminatory vision" (Lightfoot, 1978, page 86). The much lower relationship of high school grades to test scores found in a recent national study-- .35 for black students compared to .53 for whites--supports this contention. (Thomas, 1977). In addition, teachers may not expect as much of minority

* See Table A-6.

students as they do of whites (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968). A study of the high school performance of students in a northern California city found that minority students perceived themselves as doing well in school, thanks to praise and encouragement from their teachers, yet they actually received much lower grades than white students (Massey et al., 1975). Higher expectations and support for minority student achievement on the part of both teachers and parents would not only strengthen the relationship between parents' educational level and children's grades in school, but would also increase the achievement of black and Hispanic students overall.

In conclusion, the next step for affirmative action university outreach programs is to work with high school teachers and parents to raise the standards of achievement for black and Hispanic students, particularly in the college preparatory courses. At the same time, current affirmative action efforts to reach students and parents with timely information about the courses required for college admission must continue unabated.

Footnotes

1. Yankelovich s recent report notes that fewer college students today than formerly believe that "hard work always pays off" (40% in the early 1970s compared to 72% in the mid-1960s). In addition, parents have become less willing to make sacrifices for their children and, in turn, expect less from their children in terms of future obligations (Psychology Today, April, 1981).

2. The relationship between minority parents' and children's educational attainments may be attenuated by the fact that these data are for public high school graduates only. It is possible that the college-educated minority parents who are most concerned about their children's college preparation avoid the public school system to a greater extent than college-educated white parents. For example, in UC Berkeley's freshman class of 1979, high percentages of black and Hispanic students, compared to whites, graduated from private or parochial high schools, in the county in which UC Berkeley is located (19% of black freshmen (n=42); 46% of Hispanic freshmen (n=13); 20% of white freshmen (n=281); and 6% of Asian freshmen (n=165). These schools generally offer only the college preparatory curriculum.

3. I am indebted to David Stern (University of California, Berkeley) and Alan Blinder (Journal of Human Resources VII, 4) for their explanations of this econometric technique.

References

Alexander, Karl L., Cook, Martha; and McDill, Edward L., "Curriculum Tracking and Educational Stratification: Some Further Evidence," American Sociological Review, 43, February, 1978, pp. 47-66.

Blau, Peter M., and Duncan, Otis Dudley. The American Occupational Structure. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967.

Blinder, Alan S . "Wage Discrimination: Reduced Form and Structural Estimates," Journal of Human Resources VIII, Volume 4, pp. 436-455.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. 1976 High School Eligibility Study. Sacramento: December 13, 1976.

Duncan, Otis Dudley; Featherman, David L., and Duncan, Beverly. Socioeconomic Background and Achievement. New York: Seminar Press, 1972.

Freeman, Richard B. Black Elite: The New Market for Highly Educated Black Americans. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977.

Freeman, Richard B. The Over-Educated American. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Greeley, Andrew M., "The Ethnic Miracle," The Public Interest, Fall 1976, pp. 20-36.

Hauser, Robert M.; Sewell, William H., and Alwin, Duane F., "High School Effects on Achievement," in Schooling and Achievement in American Society, W. H. Sewell, R. M. Hauser, and D. L. Featherman (eds.), New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Jencks, Christopher S., and Riesman, David. The Academic Revolution. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1968.

Jencks, Christopher S. et al., Who Gets Ahead? The Economic Determinants of Success in America . New York: Basic Books. 1979.

Lightfoot, Sara Lawrence. Worlds Apart: Relationships Between Families and Schools. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1978.

Massey, Grace Carroll; Scott, Mona Vaughn; and Dornbusch, Sanford M., "Racism Without Racists: Institutional Racism in Urban Schools," The Black Scholar, November, 1975, pp. 10-19.

Ogbu, John U. Minority Education and Caste. New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Petersen, William J. Japanese-Americans. Ethnic Groups in Comparative Perspective. Random House Series, 1971.

Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L. "Self-fulfilling Prophecies in the Classroom: Teachers' Expectations as Unintended Determinants of Pupils' Intellectual Competence," in M. Deutsch, I. Katz, and A.R. Jensen,(eds.), Social Class, Race, and Psychological Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart ¢ Winston, 1968.

References (2)

Ravitch, Diane, "Education Still Matters," Phi Delta Kappan, 60, vol. 3, November, 1978, pp. 161-164.

Sewell, William H. and Hauser, Robert M. Education, Occupation, and Earnings. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Thomas, Gail E. Race and Sex Effects on Access to College. Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Report #229, May, 1977.

University of California Systemwide Administration, Office of Outreach Services Beyond High School Graduation: Who Goes to College? A Report on a University of California Survey of the High School Class of '75. Berkeley, California. May, 1978.

Yankelovich, Daniel. Psychology Today, April, 1981.

Table 1.

Percentages of 1975 California Public High School Graduates Enrolling in the Colleges and Universities for Which They Qualify, by Ethnicity

	UC eligibles *** attending UC or other prestigious institutions		CSUC eligibles*** attending CSUC or other four-year institutions		Ineligibles*** enrolled in community college transfer programs* or four-year institutions	
	%	(n)				
Blacks	56%	(27)	74%	(78)	46%	(402**)
Chicanos	38%	(34)	48%	(163)	23%	(807)
Latinos	50%	(12)	42%	(66)	24%	(150)
Chinese	56%	(39)	58%	(72)	60%	(69)
Japanese	40%	(70)	62%	(136)	38%	(73)
Filipinos	33%	(6)	65%	(30)	16%	(69)
Other Asians	60%	(10)	69%	(25)	42%	(34)
Whites	45%	(940)	49%	(2835)	24%	(4378)

*Community college transfer program enrollment was approximated by (1) community college enrollment combined with (2) aspirations to complete at least the BA.

**Ns for students ineligible for UC or CSUC are weighted to compensate for undersampling in this portion of the high school graduate population. The average weight is about 2.3.

"Hispanics" consist of Chicanos and Latinos.

"Asians" consist of Chinese, Japanese, Filipinos, and Other Asians.

*** See text, page 1 for definition of "eligibility." All UC-eligible students are assumed to be eligible for CSUC, also.

Table 2.

Partitioning the Differences in Predicted Mean Outcomes: Components Due to Constants, Coefficients, and Means of the Nine Background Variables

Background Variables	Whites versus Blacks			
	GPA		A-F courses	
	Coeff's	Means	Coeff's	Means
Female	-.0040	-.0270	-.5720	-.0389
Parents' education	1.0500	.0235	3.4090	.4881
Family income	-.2680	.0533	-.1404	.3510
Number of sibs	-.1290	.0070	-.5074	.1633
Single parent family	-.0356	-.0020	-.1370	.0243
English-only speaking family	.1590	.00005	-.0238	.0107
GE 40% black & Hispanic in HS	.0310	.0076	.1388	-.2511
Northern Calif. metrop. county	-.0530	.0004	-.5998	-.0832
Southern Calif. metrop. county	-.1390	-.0006	-1.3523	-.0302
Constant	-.2840		.5380	
	Net effects of differences in:			
	Coeff's	Means	Coeff's	Means
	.6114	.0570	.2151	.6340
	GPA		A-F courses	
Means: Blacks	2.381		7.277	
Means: Whites	2.772		8.601	
Differences in means: $\bar{X}_{whites} - \bar{X}_{blacks}$	.391		1.324	

Differences in constants plus the net effects of differences in coefficients and means do not sum exactly to group mean differences in GPA and courses due to rounding errors in the computations (see also Tables 3 & 4).

Table 3.

Partitioning the Differences in Predicted Mean Outcomes: Components Due to Constants, Coefficients, and Means of the Nine Background Variables

Background Variables	Whites versus Hispanics			
	GPA		A-F courses	
	Coeff's	Means	Coeff's	Means
Female	.0327	.0047	.0224	-.0036
Parents' education	.5890	.1190	3.6130	1.1604
Family income	-.1710	.0317	-.3156	.3510
Number of sibs	-.1080	.0150	-.1080	.2980
Single parent family	-.0020	.0050	.0126	.0350
English-only speaking family	.0250	.0400	-.3933	-.1695
GE 40% black & Hispanic in HS	.0134	.0007	.1434	-.0767
Northern Calif. metrop. county	-.0200	-.0050	.3465	-.0373
Southern Calif. metrop. county	-.0440	.0020	.5633	-.0189
Constant	-.1890		-3.8330	
	Net effects of differences in:			
	Coeff's	Means	Coeff's	Means
	.3151	.2131	3.880	1.440
	GPA		A-F courses	
Means: Hispanics	2.451		7.020	
Means: Whites	2.772		8.601	
$\bar{X}_{whites} - \bar{X}_{Hispanics}$	.321		1.581	

Table 4.

Partitioning the Differences in Predicted Mean Outcomes: Components Due to Constants, Coefficients, and Means of the Nine Background Variables

Background Variables	Whites versus Asians			
	GPA		A-F courses	
	Coeff's	Means	Coeff's	Means
Female	.0250	-.0080	-.1900	-.0013
Parents' education	.0510	.0700	1.2765	.5338
Family income	.0570	-.0073	-.1780	.1360
Number of sibs	.0985	0091	.1670	.0510
Single parent family	.0003	-.0008	-.0430	-.0010
English-only speaking family	.0014	.0405	-.6460	-.0550
GE 40% black & Hispanic in HS	.0236	.0146	.0220	-.1120
Northern Calif. metrop. county	-.0120	.0120	.2800	-.0040
Southern Calif. metrop. county	-.0120	-.0057	.2390	.0490
Constant	-.5060		-3.018	
	Net effects of differences in:			
	Coeff's	Means	Coeff's	Means
	.2328	.1244	.9275	.5965
	GPA		A-F courses	
Means: Asians	2.925		10.163	
Means: Whites	2.772		8.601	
$\bar{X}_{whites} - \bar{X}_{Asians}$	-.153		-1.562	

Table A-1.

Means and Standard Deviations of Background Variables by Ethnicity: the California High School Graduate of 1975*

Background Variables	Blacks n=160	Hispanics n=359	Asians n=233	Whites n=2700
Female	.603	.477	.533	.498
Parents' education	11.962 (2.75)	9.772 (3.37)	12.135 (3.00)	13.387 (2.45)
Family income	$12,271 (7,683)	$12,391 (6,759)	$16,267 (7,390)	$19,290 (7,711)
Number of siblings	3.83 (2.47)	4.126 (2.51)	2.840 (1.77)	2.634 (1.64)
Single parent family	.209	.105	.054	.058
English only spoken in home	.916	.272	.436	.942
GE 40% black and Hispanic in HS	.645	.346	.275	.080
Northern Calif. metrop. county	.357	.176	.449	.282
Southern Calif. metrop. county	.562	.645	.429	.546
Overall GPA	2.381 (.636)	2.451 (.604)	2.925 (.65)	2.772 (.63)
Number of A-F courses taken	7.277 (3.34)	7.020 (3.21)	10.163 (4.04)	8.601 (3.51)
Enrollment in a four-year college	.334	.175	.391	.257
Number of cases (before listwise deletion)	191	434	260	3114

*Weights have been divided by the average weight for each ethnic group approximate actual sample sizes

Table A-2.

Regressions of Background Characteristics on Outcomes

for Each Ethnic Group: Whites

	Overall GPA	Number of A-F courses	Enrollment in a Four-year college	
			Step 1	Step 2
Female	.256 (.02)	-.149 (.12)	.037 (.016)	-.008 (.01)
Parents' education	.058 (.005)	.477 (.03)	.052 (.004)	.022 (.003)
Family income	-.0000008 (.000002)	.00004 (.000009)	.000003 (.000001)	.000002 .000001)
Number of siblings	-.026 (.007)	-.215 (.04)	-.017 (.005)	-.004 (.004)
Single parent family	-.119 (.05)	-.675 (.27)	.048 (.04)	.099 (.03)
English only spoken in home	.081 (.05)	-.577 (.26)	-.087 (.03)	-.081 (.03)
CE 40% black and Hispanic in HS	.029 (.04)	.636 (.23)	.080 (.03)	.049 (.03)
Northern Calif. metropolitan county	-.089 (.035)	.405 (.19)	-.015 (.02)	-.013 (.02)
Southern Calif. metropolitan county	-.061 (.03)	.664 (.17)	.032 (.02)	.018 (.02)
Overall GPA				.200 (.01)
Number of A-F courses taken				.039 (.003)
Constant	1.941 (.08)	2.152 (.45)	-.413 (.06)	-.885 (.06)
R^2 adjusted	.10	.17	.11	.34
Dep. variable mean	2.772	8.601	.257	.257
Degrees of freedom residual	2691	2691	2691	2689

*Weights have been divided by average weight for whites to approximate actual sample size

Table A-3.

Regressions of Background Characteristics on Outcomes

for Each Ethnic Group: Blacks*

	Overall GPA	Number of A-F courses	Enrollment in a Four-year college	
			Step 1	Step 2
Female	.263 (.10)	.890 (.51)	.074 (.08)	-.026 (.07)
Parents' education	-.025 (.02)	.208 (.10)	.005 (.02)	.0005 (.01)
Family income	.000016 (.000008)	.00006 (.00004)	.000007 (.000006)	.0000002 (.000005)
Number of siblings	.014 (.02)	-.058 (.11)	-.007 (.02)	-.007 (.01)
Single parent family	.148 (.13)	.353 (.67)	.087 (.10)	.038 (.09)
English only spoken in home	-.086 (.26)	-.552 (1.30)	.124 (.20)	.169 (.17)
GE 40% black and Hispanic in HS	-.056 (.11)	.253 (.53)	.033 (.08)	.033 (.07)
Northern Calif. metropolitan county	.076 (.20)	1.813 (1.00)	-.078 (.15)	-.182 (.13)
Southern Calif. metropolitan county	.190 (.19)	3.105 (.95)	-.022 (.15)	-.214 (.13)
Overall GPA				.218 (.06)
Number of A-F courses taken				.048 (.01)
Constant	2.225 (.43)	1.614 (2.15)	.054 (.33)	-.509 (.31)
R^2 adjusted	.03	.12	0	.23
Dep. var. mean	2.381	7.277	.334	.334
Degrees of freedom residual	151	151	151	149

*Weights have been divided by average weight for blacks to approximate actual sample size

Table A-4.

Regressions of Background Characteristics on Outcomes

for Each Ethnic Group: Hispanics*

	Overall GPA	Number of A-F courses	Enrollment in a Four-year college	
			Step 1	Step 2
Female	.189 (.06)	-.195 (.33)	-.014 (.04)	-.042 (.04)
Parents' education	.007 (.01)	.165 (.06)	.014 (.007)	.007 (.006)
Family income	.00001 (.000005)	.00006 (.00003)	.000003 (.000003)	-.000001 (.000003)
Number of siblings	.006 (.01)	-.183 (.07)	.007 (.009)	.012 (.008)
Single parent family	-.092 (.10)	-.829 (.54)	-.017 (.07)	.028 (.06)
English only spoken in home	.040 (.08)	.071 (.39)	-.003 (.05)	-.013 (.04)
GE 40% black and Hispanic in HS	-.034 (.07)	-.037 (.34)	.037 (.04)	.045 (.04)
Northern Calif. metropolitan county	-.003 (.11)	-1.108 (.54)	-.0008 (.07)	.038 (.06)
Southern Calif. metropolitan county	.013 (.09)	-.282 (.44)	-.010 (.06)	-.002 (.05)
Overall GPA				.181 (.03)
Number of A-F courses taken				.035 (.006)
Constant	2.130 (.15)	5.985 (.77)	-.028 (.10)	-.622 (.11)
R^2 adjusted	.03	.10	0	.22
Dep. var. mean	2.451	7.020	.175	.175
Degrees of freedom residual	350	350	350	348

*Weights have been divided by average weight for Hispanics to approximate actual sample size

Table A-5.

Regressions of Background Characteristics on Outcomes

for Each Ethnic Group: Asians*

	Overall GPA	Number of A-F courses	Enrollment in a Four-year college	
			Step 1	Step 2
Female	.207 (.08)	.221 (.50)	-.047 (.06)	-.109 (.05)
Parents' education	.054 (.015)	.377 (.10)	.019 (.01)	-.012 (.01)
Family income	-.000004 (.000006)	.00005 (.00004)	.000008 (.000005)	.000007 (.000004)
Number of siblings	-.062 (.02)	-.276 (.14)	-.053 (.02)	-.025 (.014)
Single parent family	-.282 (.18)	.097 (1.13)	-.008 (.14)	.060 (.11)
English only spoken in home	.079 (.09)	.360 (.54)	.017 (.07)	-.019 (.05)
GE 40% black and Hispanic in HS	-.104 (.09)	.514 (.57)	.091 (.07)	.096 (.06)
Northern Calif. metropolitan county	-.056 (.13)	-.360 (.81)	.087 (.10)	.117 (.08)
Southern Calif. metropolitan county	-.038 (.13)	.174 (.81)	.258 (.10)	.256 (.08)
Overall GPA				.256 (.05)
Number of A-F courses taken				.044 (.01)
Constant	2.447 (.22)	5.170 (1.40)	.020 (.17)	-.831 (.17)
R^2 adjusted	.11	.12	.11	.44
Dep. variable mean	2.295	10.163	.391	.391
Degrees of freedom residual	224	224	224	222

*Weights have been divided by average weight for Asians to approximate actual sample size

Table A-6.

Distributions of GPA and College Preparatory Courses by Parents' Education and Ethnicity

OVERALL GRADE POINT AVERAGE (GPA)

Parents' education	Blacks	Hispanics	Asians	Whites
Less than high school	2.48 (159)	2.40 (632)	2.66 (157)	2.59 (1091)
High school graduate or some college	2.29 (224)	2.50 (336)	3.04 (242)	2.75 (4065)
BA/BS	2.51 (16)	2.52 (24)	3.15 (47)	2.95 (641)
Graduate school	2.55 (13)	3.07 (21)	3.09 (16)	3.07 (577)

NUMBER OF COLLEGE PREPARATORY COURSES

Parents' education	Blacks	Hispanics	Asians	Whites
Less than high school	6.9 (163)	6.4 (643)	8.4 (156)	6.7 (1115)
High school graduate or some college	7.1 (227)	7.9 (337)	10.7 (244)	8.5 (4116)
BA/BS	10.3 (16)	8.9 (24)	12.2 (47)	10.0 (651)
Graduate school	12.0 (13)	11.3 (21)	12.7 (16)	11.3 (583)

N's (in parentheses) are weighted from 4091 actual cases to 10,000.